2/1/2025

The Lesser of Two Evils Voting

The concept of choosing the "lesser of two evils" in an election is a common dilemma faced by voters, where they must decide between candidates who do not fully align with their moral or ideological beliefs. This situation often arises in a two-party system where the options are limited, and the decision comes down to selecting the candidate who is perceived to cause the least harm or has the fewest drawbacks. It's a pragmatic approach to voting, acknowledging that in a complex world, pure candidates who embody all of one's values and beliefs are rare, and thus, compromise becomes a necessary part of the electoral process.

In such scenarios, voters are encouraged to weigh the consequences of each candidate's policies and their potential impact on society. The idea is not to choose a perfect candidate but to prevent the one who could cause greater damage from taking office. This method of decision-making is deeply rooted in the concept of utilitarianism, which suggests that the best action is the one that maximizes utility, usually defined as that which produces the greatest well-being of the greatest number of people.

The recent statements by Pope Francis, as reported by various news outlets, highlight the moral complexity of such decisions. He suggests that when faced with two candidates who both hold positions that are contrary to the church's teachings, Catholics should vote with their conscience and choose the lesser evil. This guidance underscores the ethical conundrum that arises in elections, particularly when each candidate supports policies that could be seen as morally objectionable.

The "lesser of two evils" approach is not without its critics. Some argue that it perpetuates a cycle of settling for subpar leadership and hinders the emergence of better alternatives. Others believe that it is a realistic reflection of the political landscape, where ideal options are not always

available, and the goal should be to minimize harm rather than to seek an unattainable perfection.

Ultimately, the decision to vote for the "lesser of two evils" is a personal one, rooted in individual values, beliefs, and assessments of the potential outcomes. It is a decision that requires careful consideration of the broader implications of one's choice, beyond personal preference or partisan loyalty. In a democracy, this choice is the essence of the voter's power and responsibility, reflecting the complex interplay between individual ethics and collective well-being.